

D BOTTOM

| UNCLASSIFIED | CONFIDENTIAL | SECRET |
|--|--|----------------|
| CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY | | STAT |
| OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP | | |
| TO | NAME AND ADDRESS | DATE |
| 1 | Tnebel | 10 Jan |
| 2 | Weiss ^{comment} _{alligned from Simon} | 17 Jan |
| 3 | Kriebel | 18 Jan |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| ACTION | DIRECT REPLY | PREPARE REPLY |
| APPROVAL | DISPATCH | RECOMMENDATION |
| COMMENT | FILE | RETURN |
| CONCURRENCE | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION | SIGNATURE |
| Remarks: | | |
| <p>Note my comments attached.</p> <p>STAT</p> <p>Ref. comment 1: Greater precision can be achieved with confidence. The stations are named are named according to their mission; they are engineered to cover the mission area; and programs are normally organized to serve that area.</p> | | |
| FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER | | |
| FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO. | | DATE |
| Chief, Editorial Division | | 9 Jan 67 |
| UNCLASSIFIED | CONFIDENTIAL | SECRET |

ial equip-
ment and facilities to monitor these stations beyond their normal range has no relevance to the actual station-audience relationship. We can only help rather than mislead our readers by giving them the best source-line perspective. Labeling everything "domestic" certainly does not do that. MOS has received complaints about "domestic."

2. The China change is the first step toward improving regional sourcelines globally. It is more urgently needed due to China situation.
3. I cannot agree that the ambiguous use of "Domestic" is preferable or less confusing than something which describes a known fact. Service ranges can be described accurately, so why accept less. It may not always be useful to the consumer, but why withhold it when it is in other cases. Let's give the best we have to offer. Regional (as opposed to other) sourcelines did not "plague us" with "complicated differentiations" years ago as alleged. Everything was called "regional," which is very uncomplicated, but like "domestic" not meaningful enough.

STAT

Sourceline
~~*Sourceline*~~

Chief, Editorial Division
Chief, Radio Propaganda Division

4 January 1967

Chief, Field Operations Staff

Chinese Domestic Sourcelines

1. Under current sourceline policy all broadcasts originating from any transmitter within a given country which are intended for domestic consumption of any sort are sourcelined "domestic service." A national broadcast through a sophisticated network of highpowered transmitters receives the same sourceline as a local broadcast through a "peanut whistle" serving no more than a thirty mile radius around a small city. With the situation currently prevailing in the CPR, it is considered this sourceline policy is not adequate to assist consumers in correct evaluation of monitored items. In the current political struggle there can be considerable significance whether a statement is made at a national, provincial, local or other regional level, and the sourceline should make it possible for the consumer to identify basic differentiations.

2. To achieve a useful perspective it is proposed to reserve the sourceline "domestic service" for national broadcasts emanating from Peking's Central Broadcasting Station, and to modify sourcelines of regional stations as follows:

a. Transmitters announcing a provincial name will be sourcelined "provincial service" following the names of the city and province. Transmitters in the same city which announce only the city name will be sourcelined "local service"; e.g. Hangchow Chekiang Provincial Service in Mandarin; Hangchow Local Service in Mandarin.

b. Transmitters announcing only a city name which are located elsewhere than the provincial capital will also be sourcelined "local service"; e.g. Ningpo Local Service in Mandarin.

c. Transmitters announcing a geographic name other than the city or province will be sourcelined "regional service", naming the region, and will be attributed to the city of origin; e.g. Haikou Hainan Regional Service in Mandarin.



STAT

9 January 1967

COMMENTS

Ref: Kriebel Memo 4 Jan 67; Subject: Chinese Domestic Sourcelines

1. Admittedly greater precision, if we could achieve it with confidence, is better than the blanket use of "domestic service" at the various levels from local, city, provincial, autonomous republic, etc., up to the nationwide services out of Peking. But we cannot achieve this precision: "local broadcasts" can be heard beyond the local area, "Provincial broadcasts" can be heard in other provinces, and broadcasts of the autonomous republics can be heard outside of the "autonomous republic." Obviously the answer to this is that the sourceline should define the intended audience, so as to avoid confusion between major national transmissions out of Peking, for example, and purely local broadcasts out of Hofei, for example. My feeling has been and is that our present use of domestic service for all levels carries the proper implication that these are broadcasts intended for audiences served by those particular stations and that we make no absolute statements as to how far they can be heard. While it is obviously true that broadcasts from local stations concern themselves with more parochial problems with respect to that area, this can be discerned from the content of the broadcast and beside the differences between the local content and the national materials out of Peking are not strikingly significant beyond what normally could be expected and discerned by the very nature of the source broadcasting. I don't think that under our present procedure there is anyone who equates broadcast content out of Hangchow with content out of Peking. Different lines and different stories obviously will appear but nothing that the Hangchow radio does can prevent the broadcasts from being heard elsewhere, although the range of course is limited.

2. I would regret to see a very precise set of sourcelines instituted for the CPR, while retaining the present system for all other areas of the world. Moreover, precision in a sourceline can work both ways. It could lead an analyst to believe that a given item was intended only for a very restricted audience despite the fact that the transmitter may have a wider range, and to disregard the possibility that the same item may have been broadcast by several other local and/or provincial services but was filed from one particular transmitter.

3. To sum up, I like the use of the present "domestic service." I don't think it confuses many people and I do not think it lends itself to improper conclusions to the degree that we should go back to the complicated differentiations which plagued us years ago. In short, I do not concur with this proposal.

Chief, Editorial Division

STAT

16 January 1967

COMMENT ON KRIEBEL/COUCH NOTES ON CHINESE SOURCELINES

I feel that if we want to establish a "useful perspective" and distinguish between Peking and its 21 provinces, 5 autonomous regions and Shanghai municipality, it might be easier to change the sourceline designation for Peking rather than to further refine and fragmentize the sourcelines for the 27 provincial units. Thus, if most transmissions as we receive them are meant for a national audience, why not refer to Peking casts as "Peking National Service"?

As for the provincial radios, in the long run, I doubt whether it is really necessary or desirable to distinguish between what is intended for the administrative capital city and what is intended for the province as a whole. Without getting into the "technical feasibility" of such an effort, I'm afraid we would be advertising a service that might quickly raise more questions than answers, and put demands on FBIS that would out-reach our resources.

The introduction of new terms of precision such as "district", "region", "area" and so forth, might also conflict with Chinese Communist administrative designations for dissimilar jurisdictions. I don't believe generally that analysts would appreciate the fragmentation of the provincial service--drawing distinctions between citywide and provincewide broadcasts--which in effect would double what is already a pretty fragmented situation. I feel that the better measure of intended audience for any given broadcast is still content-rather than frequency-analysis at the provincial level.

As for the "domestic service" designation for provincial radios, I would rather see the issue approached from the side of clarity rather than precision. As things now stand, some readers do not know whether Foochow is a provincial capital or the province itself. And of those who can make this distinction, there are still others who would not know in which province Foochow belongs. On occasion, reading the sourceline and the content of the item itself does not provide the answer. Why, then, can't we say, instead of "Foochow Domestic Service", "Foochow (Fukien) Provincial Service"? In the case of the five autonomous regions we might say, instead of "Urumchi Domestic Service", "Urumchi (Sinkiang Autonomous Region) Service", or "Urumchi (Sinkiang A.R.) Service." For the separate case of Shanghai, we could say "Shanghai (Municipal) Service." In the case of Haikou, Hainan Island, the provincial jurisdiction (Kwang-tung) might be omitted.

cc: Chief, Editorial Division

STAT